DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 727 HE 022 701

AUTHOR Murray, Frances; Feitler, Fred C.
TITLE An Investigation of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness in Small College Settings.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 89
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; Enrollment Trends; Higher Education; *Leadership; Models; *Organizational Effectiveness; Private Colleges; School Effectiveness; *Small Colleges; Student Characteristics; Success
IDENTIFIERS *Transformational Leadership

ABSTRACT

The ways in which current theories of leadership relate to perceptions of organizational effectiveness are examined in a study looking at these interactions and relevant demographic factors in 11 small, private, midwestern colleges. A model of transactional and transformational leadership proposed by Bass (1985) is investigated along with an organizational effectiveness model proposed by Cameron (1978) to determine how transactional and transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness related to 12 selected demographic characteristics (e.g. enrollment, retention rate, percentage of students completing college in 4 years, percentage of students receiving financial aid, age, sex, and current position of respondent). Views of leadership, leadership and higher education, the transformational leadership perspective, and organizational effectiveness and higher education are discussed. Data for the study were obtained via two questionnaires sent to key administrators at each institution (the response rate per institution varied from 67% to 97%). Results indicate the following: there are significant relationships between perceptions of organizational effectiveness and demographic variables; the strongest relationships were with the organizational effectiveness measures; and academic excellence appears to be most predictive of variation in perception of effectiveness. Tables are included. Contains 33 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309727

AN INVESTIGATION OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN SMALL COLLEGE SETTINGS[1]

Sister Frances Murray
Notre Dame College of Ohio
Cleveland, Ohio 44121

Fred C. Feitler
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sister Frances Murray

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

[1]Prepared for presentation at the 1989 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, March 27-31, 1989.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 022 701

INTRODUCTION

The Ivy League schools and other institutions in higher education have been characterized in the popular literature as "organized anarchies" (Cohen & March, 1986). True or not, the leadership and governance structure in higher education could be expected to be different from that of a manufacturing/production organization. And within higher education, the leadership required to govern a small liberal arts institution might be quite different from a large multi-campus university or for those falling between these extremes.

How well do current theories of leadership relate to perceptions of organizational effectiveness? This study examined these interactions, relevant demographic factors in eleven small, private, midwestern colleges, and investigated a model of transactional and transformational leadership proposed by Bass (1985) and an organizational effectiveness model proposed by Cameron (1978a) to determine how transactional and transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness related to twelve selected demographic characteristics suggested by Peterson's Guide to Four-Year Colleges (1987) (see Tables 1 and 2; Appendix). The dominant coalition of each institution, consisting of key administrators from president to department chairpersons

and their subordinates, provided data about perceptions of organizational effectiveness and transformational leadership.

VIEWS OF LEADERSHIP

Leadership has been one of the most researched topics in the social sciences. During this decade, best sellers such as In Search of Excellence (1982) and Megatrends (1982) have stressed the need for more participatory decision-making and a greater focus on the components of excellence in organizations. Lippitt (1982) has identified six trends which represent organizational challenges: (a) the double bind of maintaining quality with reduced resources; (b) the expectations of shared power and responsibility; (c) the need for interdependence, collaboration, and communication; (d) the need for more people for problem-solving; (e) the integration of technological and human resources; and (f) the need for reorientation, renewal, and new competency development.

Historically, leadership theory has shifted from trait theory (1920-late 1940s) to behavioral theories (late 1940s-early 1960s) to contingency theories (late 1960s to the present). According to Chemers (1984), the contingency approaches have provided a secure foundation for a new leadership era, one focused on values, needs, and motives of both leaders and followers.

Those in search of a new leadership paradigm have re-analyzed James MacGregor Burns' concept of transformational leadership elucidated in his Pulitzer prize-winning book, Leadership (1978).

Burns distinguished between two types of leadership in the political realm: (a) transactional: one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of something valued: i.e., jobs for votes. In short, the follower learns what must be done to gain rewards and avoid punishment; (b) transformational: the leader motivates followers to work for transcendental goals instead of immediate self-interests, for achievement and self-actualization rather than safety and security. This transformational leadership thrust has received increasing attention in the literature; i.e., Bennis and Nanus (1985): Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge and Tichy and Devanna (1986): The Transformational Leader.

LEADERSHIP AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Current higher education literature has focused on future challenges (Cameron & Ulrich, 1986; Peck, 1984). The 1990s will find fewer 18-year-olds, greater competition, higher costs, reduced federal aid, and continued concern with quality (Cameron, 1986; Cyert, 1983; Green, 1981; McCorkle & Archibald, 1982).

A new set of administrative and organizational responses is required (Jonsen, 1984; Whetten, 1981). Leadership that stimulates and inspires is a crucial factor in determining which organizations will ultimately succeed (Waldman, Yammarino, Avolio, 1986; Bennis, 1984). The revitalized interest in leadership studies, looking to a possible paradigm shift (i.e., transactional leadership to transformational leadership), has been investigated in business, industrial, governmental, and military settings (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Tichy & Devanna, 1986). The extension of the study of transformational leadership to higher education settings, the institutions with which many researchers on leadership theory are familiar, was timely. Both Bass (1985) and Tichy & Devanna (1986) have urged this extension.

Small, private, liberal arts colleges have been particularly challenged. In a study of such colleges, Peck (1984) found that:

> effective leadership and an effective college existed in a symbiotic relationship. For leadership to be effective, the conditions in the college had to be receptive to the kind of leadership provided. And for the college as a whole to be labeled effective, leadership had to be exerted in a particular way (p. 272).

The present study investigated models of both elements in this symbiosis: leadership and organizational effectiveness.

THE TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP PERSPECTIVE

Bernard Bass (1985) in LEADERSHIP AND PERFORMANCE BEYOND EXPECTATIONS distinguished between the transactional and the transformational leader in groups and complex organizations. Bass described the transactional leader as recognizing what followers want to derive from their work and providing appropriate rewards for expected performance (i.e., responding to subordinates' immediate self-interests) (p. 11). Bass described the transformational leader (a) as motivating followers to do more than they ever expected to do by raising their level of awareness and consciousness about the importance and value of reaching designated outcomes; (b) as encouraging followers to transcend their own self-interests for the sake of the organization; and (c) altering subordinates' need levels on Maslow's hierarchy or expanding their portfolio of needs and wants (p. 20).

Bass' leadership model includes two transactional and three transformational factors:

TRANSACTIONAL

1) contingent reward: the degree to which the leader makes clear what the follower must accomplish in order to be rewarded

2) management by exception: the degree to which the leader provides negative feedback for failure to meet agreed-upon standards

TRANSFORMATIONAL

1) charisma/inspirational leadership: the degree to which the leader makes followers enthusiastic, commands respect, inspires loyalty, has a sense of mission, sees what is really important

2) intellectual stimulation: the degree to which the leader provides intellectual and problem-oriented guidance

3) individualized consideration: the degree to which the leader is concerned with the individual needs of followers (i.e., mentoring); leader delegates in order to stimulate and create learning experiences; leader treats each person with respect (Waldman, Bass, Einstein, 1985, pp. 6-7)

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Accurate measures of organizational effectiveness are disputed in the literature, especially regarding measurement and appropriateness of assessment techniques. Four major problems with organizational effectiveness research are summarized by Cameron (1986): (a) inadequacy in identifying indicators of effectiveness; (b) over-reliance on single indicators; (c) under-specified models, ignoring the time-frame of the criterion variables; and (d) overgeneralization to dissimilar organizations and subunits.

Research to develop a valid instrument for assessing organizational effectiveness in higher education settings (Cameron, 1978a), yielded nine dimensions:

1) STUDENT EDUCATIONAL SATISFACTION: degree of satisfaction of students with their educational experiences at the institution

2) STUDENT ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT: extent of academic attainment, growth, and progress of students at the institution

3) STUDENT CAREER DEVELOPMENT: extent of acceptable development of students and the emphasis on career development along with the opportunities for career development provided by the institution

4) STUDENT PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT: student development in non-academic, non-career oriented areas (i.e., socially, emotionally, culturally) and the opportunities provided by the institution for personal development

5) FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR EMPLOYMENT SATISFACTION: satisfaction of faculty members and administrators with jobs and employment at the institution

6) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT/QUALITY OF FACULTY: extent of professional attainment and development of faculty; amount of stimulation toward professional development provided by the institution

7) SYSTEM OPENNESS/COMMUNITY INTERACTION: emphasis placed on interaction with, adaptation to, and service in the external environment

8) ABILITY TO ACQUIRE RESOURCES: ability of the institution to acquire resources from the external environment (i.e., good students and faculty, financial support, etc.)

9) ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH: benevolence, vitality, viability in the internal processes and practices at the

institution (Cameron, 1978a, p. 614).

METHOD

The Carnegie Foundation's classification of colleges was the basis for selecting all the small, private, four-year, coeducational, liberal arts, undergraduate institutions in Ohio. Several institutions in states adjacent to Ohio, (i.e., Indiana and Michigan), were included to increase the sample size and to insure a fuller range of institutions within demographic categories. Descriptive data for each institution were secured from Peterson's Guide to Four Year Colleges (1987) and a sample of 27 institutions was compiled. From these, eleven presidents agreed to have their institutions participate.

Data were obtained using two questionnaires: THE ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND EFFECTIVENESS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (K.S.Cameron, 1976) was mailed together with a cover letter to 15 key administrators in each institution (i.e., academic, financial, general, student affairs administrators, deans, and heads of academic departments). The respondents were selected by the researcher to conform to Cameron's designations. The sample of department chairpersons was selected randomly for each institution.

The MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE, Form 5 (Revised) (B.M.Bass, 1985) was mailed, together with a cover letter, to a person who reported to each of the

persons completing the effectiveness questionnaire. In the case of multiple reportees, the researcher randomly selected the respondent. Of the 332 questionnaires mailed, 287 (86%) were returned and useable. The response rate per institution varied from 67% to 97%.

One-way analysis of variance was performed on each of the five leadership factors and nine organizational effectiveness dimensions and each of the demographic variables. Seven of the demographic characteristics selected were institutional in nature (enrollment, percentage of full-time faculty with Ph.D. degree, percentage of financial aid recipients, percentage of graduates going on to further study, retention rate, percentage of entering undergraduates who graduate after four years, percentage of students who represent the top 25% of their high school graduating class) and five were characteristics of respondents in the study (current institutional position, number of years in the present position, number of years in the institution, age, and sex). Table 1 indicates the groupings of institutions by demographic characteristics and Table 2 presents an overview of the respondent categories based on the demographic characteristics of the eleven participating institutions. The Newman-Keuls post-hoc test was performed to verify the magnitude of significant relationships among groups.

The researcher posited that a significant relationship

would exist between transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness profiles and the following demographic factors: enrollment, the percentage of full-time faculty members holding the Ph.D., the retention rate, the percentage of students who graduate after four years, the percentage of graduates going on for further study, and the age and sex of the questionnaire respondents.

RESULTS

Significant relationships were found between eight of nine effectiveness dimensions and three of five leadership factors and demographic variables. The strongest significant relationships were with the organizational effectiveness measures (see Table 3).

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS GOING ON FOR FURTHER STUDY

The strongest relationships were between six of the nine measures of organizational effectiveness and the percentage of students going on for further study.

The five institutions with 0-13% going on differed significantly ($\bar{X}$= 4.81) from the four institutions with 28-41% doing so ($\bar{X}$= 4.31) in the Student Career Development dimension. The emphasis in the first group is preparation for employment, vis-a-vis continuation of formal education for the latter group.

Institutions with 0-13% (Group 1) and 28-41% (Group 3) going on differed significantly from the two institutions in Group 2 (14-27%) on three dimensions: (a) Student Personal

Development (p=.044); (b) Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction (p=.005); (c) System Openness and Community Interaction (p=.013):

Student Personal Development			Faculty/Administrator Employment Satisfaction			System Openness/ Community Interac.		
	Mean	SD		Mean	SD		Mean	SD
Grp 1	4.62	.14	Grp 1	4.25	.10	Grp 1	4.73	.30
Grp 2	4.35	.21	Grp 2	3.78	.30	Grp 2	3.98	.21
Grp 3	4.73	.10	Grp 3	4.27	.07	Grp 3	4.83	.20

An explanation for these differences is that the 0-13% group is career-oriented; the group with 28-41% going on is oriented toward further schooling while the group with 14-27% going on is struggling to maintain both orientations or is ambivalent.

The four institutions in the 28-41% group are distinguished from the other two categories of institutions on Professional Development/Quality of the Faculty (Group 3: $\bar{X}$= 4.36; Group 1: $\bar{X}$= 3.34, Group 2: $\bar{X}$= 2.95) and Ability to Acquire Resources (Group 3: $\bar{X}$= 4.74; Group 1: $\bar{X}$= 3.05, Group 2: $\bar{X}$= 2.77). An explanation is that students in these institutions receive both the training and financial backing to take advantage of further academic opportunities.

FACULTY WITH PH.D.

Another set of relationships was found between five of the nine measures of organizational effectiveness and the percentage of full-time faculty members holding the Ph.D.

degree. The institutions with 70-89% of their full-time faculty with the Ph.D. degree were found to be significantly different regarding: Professional Development/Quality of the Faculty ($p=.047$), System Openness and Community Interaction ($p=.039$), and the Ability to Acquire Resources ($p=.0004$).

The mean for the colleges with the greatest number of Ph.D. faculty was higher on Professional Development/Quality of the Faculty and Ability to Acquire Resources than the mean for institutions with fewer Ph.D. faculty. The group of colleges with 70-89% of faculty with Ph.Ds ($\bar{X}= 4.83$) differed from the group with 50-69% with the terminal degree ($\bar{X}= 4.24$) on the System Openness/Community Interaction dimension.

In Career Development, the 30-49% institutions differed significantly ($\bar{X}= 4.90$) from the 70-89% group ($\bar{X}= 4.31$) with career development emphasized in the former group.

In Student Personal Development, the 30-49% institutions differed significantly ($\bar{X}= 4.72$) from those with 10-29% Ph.D. ($\bar{X}= 4.34$) and 50-69% Ph.D. ($\bar{X}= 4.48$). The 70-89% group ($\bar{X}= 4.73$) also differed from the lowest group (10-29% with Ph.D.; $\bar{X}= 4.34$). These results, though statistically significant, are not readily interpretable. Further examination of additional data is needed.

SEX OF THE RESPONDENT

A significant relationship was found between the sex of the respondent and three of the effectiveness dimensions. Males saw Student Educational Satisfaction ($p=.002$) and the Ability of the institution to Acquire Resources ($p=.006$) more favorably than did females. Females viewed Student Career Development more favorably ($p=.006$) than did their male counterparts. Women may be more involved with students in career-related activities while men are generally more involved in other administrative areas.

CURRENT POSITION/AGE OF RESPONDENT

The variable, Inspirational Leadership, and the effectiveness dimension, Student Academic Development, were significantly related to the current institutional position held by the respondent. In addition, the leadership variable, Intellectual Stimulation, was related to the age of the respondent. Although other demographic variables approached significance, these are not reported here.

Administrators saw more evidence of Inspirational Leadership ($p=.018$) in the institution than did department chairpersons, faculty, professional staff, or support staff. With the relationship of the organizational effectiveness measure Student Academic Development ($p=.001$) and current position, the administrators again have a higher mean ($\bar{X}= 4.37$) than the department chairpersons ($\bar{X}= 4.09$). Although Cameron generally found that position held did not affect response in this area, he (Cameron, 1978a) also found

that Student Academic Development was significantly related (p=.05) to position. The current study results indicate that higher level administrators in the institutions surveyed have a higher regard for the ability of those institutions and the persons in them to challenge and meet the academic needs of students than do department chairpersons.

For age of respondent, the 18-28 group differed significantly (p=.021) from other groups in their view of intellectual stimulation. Being more idealistic and excited about challenging situations, they are able to appreciate the opportunities given to analyze, formulate, implement, interpret, and evaluate (Wortman, 1982). This finding supports the possibility that providing differential opportunities for specific age groups within an organization may increase both morale and productivity.

ENROLLMENT

Enrollment and the transactional leadership factor, Contingent Reward, was signficantly different (p=.039) in the three institutions with a student body of 1400-1799 compared to the two categories of smaller colleges. Perhaps larger institutions must operate on a more give and take basis due to larger numbers, expectations, and greater bureaucratization. Bass' research (1985) has demonstrated that Contingent Reward, a transactional factor, is more highly correlated with transformational leadership

factors than is the other transactional factor, management-by-exception (Avolio & Bass, 1986).

RETENTION

For retention and the organizational effectiveness dimension, Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction, the interaction was significant. Personnel from institutions with 40-99% retention were significantly more satisfied than personnel from institutions with 20-39% retention.

FINANCIAL AID, FOUR-YEAR ATTENDANCE, TOP 25% OF CLASS, NUMBER OF YEARS RESPONDENT IN INSTITUTION/POSITION

Finally, no significant differences were found between the number of students receiving financial aid in an institution, the number of students who complete their education in four years, the number of students the institution attracts from the top 25% of their high school graduating classes, the number of years a respondent occupied a particular position or the number of years a respondent served a particular institution and either transformational leadership factors or organizational effectiveness dimensions. However, several nearly significant relationships ($p=.051$ to $.075$) were found with the first three demographics and five of the effectiveness dimensions:

Percentage of Financial Aid Recipients and Professional Development/Quality of Faculty ($p= .051$)

Completion of College in Four Years and Student Academic Development ($p= .055$)

Faculty/Administrator Employmt. Satisfaction ($p = .068$)

Percentage of Students from Top 25% of High School Graduating Class and
Ability to Acquire Resources ($p = .075$)
Organizational Health ($p = .056$)

Overall, significant relationships were found with at least one of the demographic variables and the leadership factors--intellectual stimulation, inspirational leadership, and contingent reward. Charisma can be considered closely akin to inspirational leadership in Bass' theoretical framework. Further, Bass indicates that individualized consideration is not used by every transformational leader and management-by-exception only correlates with the other transactional factor, contingent reward, which was also a finding in this study.

Significant relationships were found with all of the organizational effectiveness dimensions except Organizational Health. In Cameron's work, discriminant validity was weakest for the two organizational effectiveness dimensions: Student Educational Satisfaction and Organizational Health (Cameron, 1978b, p. 91). These were also found to be the weakest dimensions in this study. While Student Educational Satisfaction correlated with sex of the respondent, Organizational Health had only a nearly significant relationship with the number of students who represent the top 25% of their high school graduating classes.

One relationship expected was that the percentage of

students who graduate after four years would be related to the leadership factors and organizational effectiveness dimensions; this was not supported. However, position held within the institution was, unexpectedly, related to both Inspirational Leadership and the effectiveness dimension, Student Academic Development.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Respondents selected for this study were limited to members of the internal dominant coalition in each institution (i.e., academic, financial, general, student affairs administrators, deans, and heads of academic departments; Cameron, 1978a), and their subordinates. Students and other potential recipients of college services were omitted since the dominant coalition represents the major subunits influencing the direction and functioning of the organization (Thompson, 1967).

Further, although the sample of small, private colleges chosen represents a wide range of demographic indicators, the presence of additional demographic factors in other institutions may affect generalizability. The philosophical and historical positions of the institutions studied were not examined and these, too, may affect both the leadership and organizational effectiveness profiles.

Both leadership and organizational effectiveness continue to be topics of research interest. Both Bass and Cameron acknowledge the challenges still facing each model.

New developments in leadership theory (especially those of transactional and transformational leadership) are not yet at a point to supplant initiation and consideration (Seltzer and Bass, 1987, p. 16) but these contributions stimulate research endeavors to understand the complex governance patterns in higher education particularly.

No organization operates effectively on all dimensions and no single organizational effectiveness profile is necessarily better than another. Perhaps higher education will always remain a difficult arena in which to test any theory of leadership because of the prevailing organized anarchy model characterized by many areas of ambiguity (Cohen & March, 1986). In an overview of leadership literature, Dill and Fullagar (1987) suggest that a time of crisis such as that predicted for the 1990s may cause the organized anarchy model to be re-evaluated in higher education.

Because replication has continued to be a challenge in leadership and organizational effectiveness studies, the presence of validated instruments to measure these areas should facilitate longitudinal studies. Using a larger sample, different institutions, or different categories within institutions as a point of comparison may yield different results. While the organizational effectiveness instrument used here was specifically designed for higher education institutions, the leadership instrument

employed terminology reflective of superior/subordinate relationships more common to business and industry. More attempts at external validity are needed as well as more fine-grained analyses to determine how leadership variables can preserve or enhance organizational effectiveness.

In this study, interesting patterns emerged linking perceptions of organizational effectiveness and demographic variables. For example, institutions with the highest numbers of students going on for further study appeared to have higher levels of Professional Development/Quality of the Faculty, Ability to Acquire Resources, Student Personal Development, Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction, Student Career Development, and System Openness/Community Interaction. Among the demographic variables examined, students going on for further study and percentage of Ph.D. faculty appeared to have a common relationship to organizational effectiveness measures. These indicators of "academic excellence" appeared to be most predictive of variation in perception of effectiveness.

Because the variable, students going on for further study, is measured after the baccalaureate is completed, cause and effect are difficult to determine. Do those students going on gravitate to schools of a particular demographic type, or does a school shape the direction the students take once they become enrolled? While the statistics from this study do not provide answers, a

different study could examine the question.

Perceptual differences between higher level and lower level administrators were of interest. Higher level administrators perceived higher levels of "inspirational leadership" than did lower ranked respondents. The possible desire for self-aggrandizement for those near the top or deprecation by those lower down may explain a portion of the differences noted in this study.

The demographics considered in this study may be instructive, both those which were significant or nearly significant and those which were not. The present study of transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness in selected small colleges is a beginning but was beneficial to the participating institutions since the profiles generated and the demographics considered can be of assistance in both short and long-range planning efforts.

REFERENCES

Atwell, R. H., & Green, M. F. (Eds.). (1981). Academic leaders as managers. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 36. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1986). Transformational leadership, charisma, and beyond. (Technical Report No. 85-90). Binghamton: State University of New York, School of Management.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: The Free Press.

Bennis, W. G. (1984). The four competencies of leadership. Training and Development Journal, August, 14-19.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper Colophon.

Cameron, K. S. (1978a). Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 604-632.

Cameron, K. S. (1978b). Organizational effectiveness: Its measurement and prediction in higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, Yale University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 341A-342A.

Cameron, K. S. (1986). A study of organizational effectiveness and its predictors. Management Science, 32 (1), 87-112.

Cameron, K. S., & Ulrich, D. O. (1986). Transformational leadership in colleges and universities. In J. R. Smart (Ed.), Higher education: Handbook of theory and research (pp. 1-42). New York: Agathon.

Chemers, M. M. (1984). The social, organizational, and cultural context of effective leadership. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives, (pp. 91-112). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cyert, R. M. (1983). Foreword. In G. Keller. Academic strategy (pp. vi-vii). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Dill, D. D., & Fullagar, P. K. (1987). Leadership and administrative style. In M. W. Peterson & L. A. Mets (Eds.), Key resources on higher education governance, management, and leadership. A guide to the literature (pp. 390-411). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Green, M. F. (1981). Developing leadership: A paradox in academe. In R. H. Atwell, & M. F. Green. (Eds.), Academic leaders as managers (pp. 11-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jonsen, R. W. (1984). Small colleges cope with the eighties. Journal of Higher Education, 55, (2), 171-183.

Keller, G. (1983). Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kellerman, B. (Ed.) (1984). Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Lippitt, R. (1982). The changing leader-follower relationships of the 1980s. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18 (3), 395-403.

McCorkle, C. O., Jr., & Archibald, S. O. (1982). Management and leadership in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murray, S. F. (1988). A study of transformational leadership, organizational effectiveness, and demographics in selected small college settings. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Kent State University, Ohio.

Naisbitt, J. (1982). Megatrends: Ten new directions transforming our lives. New York: Warner.

Peck, R. D. (1984). Entrepreneurship as a significant factor in successful adaptation. Journal of Higher Education, 55 (2), 269-285.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row.

Peterson, M. W., & Mets, L. A. (Eds.). (1987). Key resources on higher education governance, management, and leadership. A guide to the literature. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1987). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. American Psychological Association Meeting. New York.

Smart, J. C. (Ed.). (1986). Higher education: Handbook of theory and research (Vol. II). New York: Agathon.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). Organizations in action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). The transformational leader. New York: John Wiley.

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Einstein, W. O. (1985). Effort, performance and transformational leadership in industrial and military service. (Working paper No. 85-80). New York: SUNY--Binghamton, School of Management.

Waldman, D. A., Yammarino, F. J., & Avolio, B. J. (1986). Toward understanding transformational leaders: The three I's. Unpublished manuscript. School of Management: State University of New York at Binghamton.

Whetten, D. A. (1981). Organizational responses to scarcity: Exploring the obstacles to innovative approaches to retrenchment in education. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17 (3), 80-97.

Wortman, M. S. (1982). Strategic management and changing leader-follower roles. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18, 371-383.

Table 1

Summary of Groupings of Institutions by Demographic Characteristics

Enrollment

Group 1 (600- 999 students): 4 institutions
Group 2 (1000-1399 students): 4 institutions
Group 3 (1400-1799 students): 3 institutions

Percentage of full-time faculty with Ph.D. degree

Group 1 (10-29%): 2 institutions
Group 2 (30-49%): 3 institutions
Group 3 (50-69%): 2 institutions
Group 4 (70-89%): 4 institutions

Percentage of students receiving financial aid

Group 1 (0-24%): 1 institution
Group 2 (25-49%): 1 institution
Group 3 (50-74%): 5 institutions
Group 4 (75-99%): 4 institutions

Percentage of graduates going on for further study

Group 1 (0-13%): 5 institutions
Group 2 (14-27%): 2 institutions
Group 3 (28-41%): 4 institutions

Retention rate

Group 1 (20-39%): 1 institution
Group 2 (40-59%): 1 institution
Group 3 (60-79%): 3 institutions
Group 4 (80-99%): 6 institutions

Percentage of students completing college in four years

Group 1 (25-39%): 2 institutions
Group 2 (40-54%): 2 institutions
Group 3 (55-67%): 5 institutions
Group 4 (68-81%): 2 institutions

Percentage of entering freshmen representing top 25% of high school graduating class *

Group 1 (30-43%): 4 institutions
Group 2 (44-57%): 2 institutions
Group 3 (58-71%): 3 institutions

*information not available from two institutions

Table 2

Overview of Respondent Categories based on

Demographic Characteristics of the Eleven Institutions

Current position of respondent:	N	%
Leadership Questionnaire		
Administrators	39	29.8
Department Chairpersons	3	2.3
Faculty	58	44.3
Professional Staff	21	16.0
Support Staff	10	7.6
Effectiveness Questionnaire		
Administrators	84	53.8
Department Chairpersons	72	46.2

Number of years at institution:	Leadership		Effectiveness	
	N	%	N	%
less than 1 year	10	7.8	6	3.8
1-2 years	18	14.0	10	6.4
3-5 years	29	22.7	26	16.7
6-10 years	27	21.1	36	23.1
11-15 years	13	10.2	25	16.0
16-20 years	15	11.7	24	15.4
21-30 years	13	10.2	24	15.4
30+ years	3	2.3	5	3.2

Number of years in present position in institution:	Leadership		Effectiveness	
less than 1 year	17	13.2	12	7.7
1-2 years	22	17.0	20	12.9
3-5 years	44	34.1	65	41.9
6-10 years	20	15.5	33	21.3
11-15 years	9	7.0	12	7.7
16-20 years	9	7.0	6	3.9
21-30 years	5	3.9	6	3.9
30+ years	3	2.3	1	.7
Age				
18-28 years	8	6.3	0	0
29-39 years	41	32.0	32	20.6
40-50 years	45	35.2	66	42.6
51-61 years	26	20.3	51	32.9
62+ years	8	6.2	6	3.9
Sex				
Male	68	52.0	105	67.0
Female	63	48.0	51	33.0

Table 3

Summary of Significant Results: Leadership/Effectiveness Measures and Demographics

Demographics / Leadership and Effectiveness Characteristics	Enrollment	Fac. with Ph.D.	Financial Aid	Further Study	Retention	Graduate/4 years	Top 25% H.S.Class	Position	Years at Inst/Pos.	Age	Sex
Charisma											
Individual Consideration											
Intellectual Stimulation										*	
Inspirational Leadership								*			
Contingent Reward	*										
Management by Exception											
Student Educational Satisfaction											**
Student Academic Development								***			
Student Career Development		*		*							*
Student Personal Development		**		*							
Faculty/Admin Employment Satisfaction				**	**						
Professional Development/ Quality of Faculty		*		*							
System Openness/ Community Interaction		*		*							
Ability to Acquire Resources		***		***							**
Organizational Health											

*p= .05 **p= .01 ***p= .001